UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/756,784	01/13/2004	Nicolas Steven Huslak	9400-63 (030409)	2875

39072   7590   02/18/2009
AT&T Legal Department - MB
Attn: Patent Docketing
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

EXAMINER
HASHEM, LISA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2614	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/18/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/756,784	HUSLAK ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		LISA HASHEM	2614

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 November 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

FINAL DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-51 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 11-12-2008 regarding the 35 USC § 112 rejections of claims

1-51 in the Non-final office action filed on 6-10-2008 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

        Applicant argues '…that the term 'and/or' in the claims are well-defined logical construct

of an alternative expression…'. As noted in MPEP 2173.01, '…Applicant may use functional

language, alternative expressions, negative limitations, or any style of expression or format of

claim which makes clear the boundaries of the subject matter for which protection is sought…'.

As noted in the 35 USC § 112 rejections of claims 1-51 below, it is not clear what is meant by

the use of the '…and/or…' terms in the claimed limitations. Appropriate action is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claims 1-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention. Claims 1-52 recite the limitation "QoS and/or bandwidth allocation". It is unclear

if the claims include QoS and bandwidth allocation or one of QoS and bandwidth allocation.

5.   Claims 20, 46, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. Claims 20, 46, and 51 recite the limitation "video and/or

audio application flow". It is unclear if the claims include video and audio application flow or

one of video and audio application flow.

6.   Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention. Claim 39 recites the limitation "RG and/or the RAN". It is unclear if the claims

include RG and RAN or one of RG and RAN.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat.

Appl. Publ. 2005/0010638 by Richardson et al, hereinafter Richardson in view of DSL

Evolution-Architecture Requirements for the Support of QoS Enabled IP Services, Revision 8,

hereinafter DSL Evolution (Applicant submitted in IDS filed on 6-7-2004).

        Regarding claim 1, Richardson discloses a videoconferencing method using Quality of

Service (QoS) and/or bandwidth allocation in a Regional/Access Network (RAN) (Fig. 3; Fig.

8A) (section 0056-0057; 0060) that provides end-to-end transport between an Application

Service Provider (ASP) (Fig. 8A, 205; videoconference server) and Customer Premises

Equipment (CPE) (Fig. 8A: 802, 806) (section 0094-0103), the method comprising:

receiving, by the ASP (i.e. videoconference server), a request for a videoconference designating

a plurality of participants (i.e. unicast session when two participants are involved or multicast

session when more than two participants are involved) from one of the plurality of participants

(section 0095; 0200-0201; 0206; 0209); requesting, by the ASP (i.e. videoconference server), a

desired QoS and/or bandwidth allocation for the videoconference for the plurality of participants

from the RAN using at least one call (i.e. policy server including policy information for a

requested videoconference session) responsive to the received request for a videoconference

(section 0067-0068; 0103; 0138; 0201; 0205-0206); and activating the videoconference for the

plurality of participants using the desired QoS and/or bandwidth allocation (section 0103; 0201;

0205-0206).

      Richardson does not disclose an Application Programming Interface (API) call

responsive to the received request for a videoconference.

      DSL Evolution discloses a method using Quality of Service (QoS) and/or bandwidth

allocation (Section 4.2.2.2, page 12) in a Regional/Access Network (RAN) (Section 4.2.5, Fig.

11: Regional/Access Network, page 17; Fig. 20: Access Network, page 30) that provides end-to-

end transport between an Application Service Provider (ASP) (Fig. 2: ASP Network, Section 3.2,

page 7) and Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) (Section 4.2.5, page 17; Fig. 20: CPE, page

30), the method comprising:

receiving, by the ASP, a request for a videoconference (Section 2.1-2.2, pages 2-4; Section 3.2:

The Application Service Provider (ASP), page 7; Section 5.1, page 26; Section 5.3.1: Phase 1,

page 30; Section C.1.1: CPE, page 45); requesting, by the ASP, a desired QoS and/or bandwidth

allocation for the videoconference for participants (i.e. users) from the RAN using at least one

Application Programming Interface (API) call responsive to the received request for a

videoconference (Section 3.2: The Application Service Provider (ASP), page 7; Section 3.3.1,

page 8; Section 4.2.2.1-4.2.2.2, pages 11-12; Section 7.2, page 35); and activating the

videoconference for the participants using the desired QoS and/or bandwidth allocation (Section

4.2.2.2, page 12), wherein the API includes an Application-to-Network Interface (ANI) (Fig. 2:

ANI, page 7; Section 4.2.2.1-4.2.2.2, Fig. 5: A10-ASP, pages 11-12) that is defined between the

RAN and the ASP (Fig. 2, page 7; Fig. 5, page 11).

Again, Richardson discloses the claimed method except Richardson uses at least one call responsive to the received request for a videoconference rather than one API call. However, the claimed feature of an API call responsive to the received request for a videoconference was old and well known in the art. DSL Evolution clearly teaches such concept.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Richardson to include an API call responsive to the received request for a videoconference as taught by DSL Evolution. In other words, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been lead to make such a modification of Richardson to include an API call responsive to the received request for a videoconference, such as the API call of DSL Evolution, to the RAN of Richardson so the RAN of Richardson can utilize an interface to set up a videoconference session between the ASP and the RAN and allocate QoS and/or bandwidth allocation for the session.

Regarding claim 2, please see (Richardson: section 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 2.2, page 4; Section 4.2.2.2, page 12; Section 7.1, page 35).

Regarding claim 3, please see (Richardson: section 0157, 0195-0199; DSL Evolution: Section: 4.2.1.2, page 11; Section 7.2, page 35).

Regarding claim 4, please see (Richardson: section 0205-0206, 0211-0212; DSL Evolution: Section 2.2., pages 2-4; Section 5.1-5.1.1, pages 26-27).

Regarding claim 5, please see (Richardson: section 0059, 0081-0082; DSL Evolution: Section: 4.2.7.2, page 24).

Regarding claim 6, please see (Richardson: section 0055, 0065, 0069).

Regarding claim 7, please see (Richardson: section 0205).

Regarding claim 8, please see (Richardson: Fig. 2, 210; section 0056, 0068; DSL Evolution: Section 3.1, page 4; Fig. 12: BRAS, page 18; Section 4.2.5.2, pages 18-19).

Regarding claim 9, please see (Richardson: section 0117-0121; DSL Evolution: Section: 4.2.7.2, page 24).

Regarding claim 10, please see (Richardson: section 0063, 0065, 0138, 0164-0166, 0186, 0207; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.5.2, page 18).

Regarding claim 11, please see (Richardson: section 0138, 0154, 0158, 0163-0166, 0186).

Regarding claim 12, please see (Richardson: section 0138, 0154, 0158, 0163-0165, 0187, 0186).

Regarding claim 13, please see (Richardson: section 0153, 0164-0166, 0186, 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 5.3.1-5.3.2.3, pages 28-34).

Regarding claim 14, please see (Richardson: section 0101-0103, DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.1.1-4.2.1.2, pages 10-11; Section 4.2.5.1, page 17).

Regarding claim 15, please see (Richardson: section 0094-0099, 0201; DSL Evolution: Section 2.1-2.2, pages 2-4; Section 3.2, page 7; Section 5.1, page 26; Section C.1.1: CPE, page 45).

Regarding claim 16, please see (Richardson: section 0164-0166, 0186, 0205-0206, 0211-0212; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.5.2, page 18).

Regarding claim 17, please see (Richardson: section 0056, 0067, 0092, 0164-0166, 0186, CPN: Fig. 2, 225, RG: Fig. 2, 240, Fig. 1c, 138; DSL Evolution: Section 2.2., pages 2-4; Section

3.3.4, page 8; Fig. 14, page 21; Section 4.2.7, pages 22-23; Section 4.2.7.2, pages 23-24; Section 5.1-5.1.1, pages 26-27).

      Regarding claim 18, please see (Richardson: section 0142-0147; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.1.1-4.2.2.2, pages 10-12).

      Regarding claim 19, please see (Richardson: section 0153, 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 5.3.1-5.3.2.3, pages 28-34).

      Regarding claim 20, please see (Richardson: section 0164-0166, 0186, 0205-0206, 0211-0212).

      Regarding claim 21, please see (Richardson: section 0054, 0158, 0164-0166, 0186; DSL Evolution: Appendix B, pages 40-43).

      Regarding claim 22, please see (Richardson: section 0164-0166, 0178, 0186, 0205-0206, 0211-0212).

      Regarding claim 23, please see (Richardson: section 0184-0186).

      Regarding claim 24, please see (Richardson: Fig. 1c, 136, section 0092; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.7.1-4.2.7.2, pages 23-24).

      Regarding claim 25, please see (Richardson: section 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.5.2, page 18; Section 5.3.2, page 31).

      Regarding claim 26, please see (Richardson: section 0164-0166, 0186, 0205-0206).

      Regarding claim 27, please see (Richardson: section 0060; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.7.1-4.2.7.2, pages 23-24).

      Regarding claim 28, please see (Richardson: section 0164-0166, 0186; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.7.2, page 24).

Regarding claim 29, please see (Richardson: section 0060, 0101-0102, 0164-0166, 0186, 0205; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.7.2, page 24).

Regarding claim 30, please see (Richardson: section 0101-0102, 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.5-4.2.5.1, pages 17-18).

Regarding claim 31, please see (Richardson: section 0065, 0101-0102, 0205-0206).

Regarding claim 32, please see (Richardson: section 0094-0099, 0201, 0205).

Regarding claim 33, Richardson discloses a videoconferencing method using Quality of Service (QoS)and/or bandwidth allocation in a Regional/Access Network (RAN) (Fig. 3; Fig. 8A) (section 0056-0057; 0060) that provides end-to-end

transport between an Application Service Provider (ASP) (Fig. 8A, 205; videoconference server) and a Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) (Fig. 8A: 802, 806) (section 0094-0103), the method comprising:

receiving, from the ASP (i.e. videoconference server), at the RAN a modify QoS and/or bandwidth allocation message for a videoconference for a plurality of participants (i.e. unicast session when two participants are involved or multicast session when more than two participants are involved) (section 0099-0103; 0142-0147; 0164-0166; 0200-0201; 0205-0206);

identifying, by the RAN, the participants and at least one CPE associated with the participants (section 0200-0201; 0205-0206; 0209);

establishing, by the RAN, a control signal application flow, a video application flow, and an audio application flow for each of the identified participants (section 0067-0068; 0142-0147; 0153; 0205-0206);

updating the RAN with QoS and/or bandwidth information for the established application flows

based on the received modify QoS and/or bandwidth allocation message (section 0067-0068;

0134; 0142-0147; 0164-0166; 0205-0206); and

sending the QoS and/or bandwidth information for the established application

flows to the identified at least one CPE (section 0142-0147; 0164-0166; 0205-0206).

        Richardson does not disclose the RAN includes a regional broadband network, a

broadband remote access server and an access network.

        DSL Evolution discloses a method using Quality of Service (QoS)and/or bandwidth

allocation (Section 4.2.2.2, page 12) in a Regional/Access Network (RAN) (Section 4.2.5, Fig.

11: Regional/Access Network, page 17; Fig. 20: Access Network, page 30) that provides end-to-

end transport between an Application Service Provider (ASP) (Fig. 2: ASP Network, Section 3.2,

page 7) and Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) (Section 4.2.5, page 17; Fig. 20: CPE, page

30), the method comprising:

receiving, from the ASP, at the RAN a modify QoS and/or bandwidth allocation message for a

videoconference for participants (i.e. users) (Section 2.2., pages 2-4; Section 5.1-5.1.1, pages 26-

27);

identifying, by the RAN, the participants and at least one CPE associated with the participants

(Section 3.2: The Application Service Provider (ASP), pages 7-8; Section 4.2.7, pages 22-23;

Section 7.1-7.2, page 35);

establishing, by the RAN, a control signal application flow, a video application flow, and an

audio application flow for each of the identified participants (Section 5.3.1-5.3.2.3, pages 28-34);

updating the RAN with QoS and/or bandwidth information for the established application flows

based on the received modify QoS and/or bandwidth allocation message (Section 2.2., pages 2-4;

Section 5.1-5.1.1, pages 26-27); and sending the QoS and/or bandwidth information for the

established application flows to the identified at least one CPE (Section 3.2: The Application

Service Provider (ASP), pages 7-8; Section 4.2.7, pages 22-23; Section 5.3.1-5.3.2.3, pages 28-

34; Section 7.1-7.2, page 35), wherein the RAN includes a regional broadband network, a

broadband remote access server and an access network (Section 3.1, page 4; Section 4.2.5-

4.2.5.3, pages 17-19; Fig. 12: Regional Broadband Network, BRAS, Access Network, page 18).

Again, Richardson discloses the claimed method except Richardson discloses a RAN

rather than the RAN includes a regional broadband network, a broadband remote access server

and an access network. However, the claimed feature of the RAN includes a regional broadband

network, a broadband remote access server and an access network was old and well known in the

art. DSL Evolution clearly teaches such concept.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the method of Richardson to include the RAN includes a regional

broadband network, a broadband remote access server and an access network as taught by DSL

Evolution. In other words, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been lead to make such a

modification of Richardson to include the RAN includes a regional broadband network, a

broadband remote access server and an access network, such as the RAN of DSL Evolution,

to the RAN of Richardson so the RAN of Richardson can support multiple videoconference

sessions for participants and allocate QoS and/or bandwidth allocation for the session.

Regarding claim 34, please see (Richardson: section 0067-0068, 0103, 0138, 0201, 0205-

0206; DSL Evolution: Section 3.2: The Application Service Provider (ASP), page 7; Section

3.3.1, page 8; Section 4.2.2.1-4.2.2.2, pages 11-12; Section 7.2, page 35).

Regarding claim 35, please see (Richardson: section 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 2.2, page 4; Section 4.2.2.2, page 12; Section 7.1, page 35).

Regarding claim 36, please see (Richardson: section 0157, 0195-0199; DSL Evolution: Section: 4.2.1.2, page 11; Section 7.2, page 35).

Regarding claim 37, please see (Richardson: section 0142-0147; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.1.1-4.2.2.2, pages 10-12).

Regarding claim 38, please see (Richardson: section 0153, 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 5.3.1-5.3.2.3, pages 28-34).

Regarding claim 39, please see (Richardson: section 0056, 0067, 0092, 0164-0166, 0186, 0205-0206, 0211-0212, CPN: Fig. 2, 225, RG: Fig. 2, 240, Fig. 1c, 138; DSL Evolution: Section 2.2., pages 2-4; Section 3.3.4, page 8; Fig. 14, page 21; Section 4.2.7, pages 22-23; Section 4.2.7.2, pages 23-24; Section 5.1-5.1.1, pages 26-27).

Regarding claim 40, please see (Richardson: section 0054, 0158, 0164-0166, 0186; DSL Evolution: Appendix B, pages 40-43).

Regarding claim 41, please see the rejection to claim 1 above to reject the videoconferencing system in claim 41.

Regarding claim 42, please see (Richardson: section 0205-0206, 0211-0212; DSL Evolution: Section 2.2., pages 2-4; Section 5.1-5.1.1, pages 26-27).

Regarding claim 43, please see (Richardson: section 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 2.2, page 4; Section 4.2.2.2, page 12; Section 7.1, page 35).

Regarding claim 44, please see (Richardson: section 0157, 0195-0199; DSL Evolution: Section: 4.2.1.2, page 11; Section 7.2, page 35).

Regarding claim 45, please see (Richardson: MCU: videoconference session controller;

section 0205-0206).

Regarding claim 46, please see (Richardson: section 0205-0206).

Regarding claim 47, please see the rejection to claim 33 above to reject the

videoconferencing system in claim 47.

Regarding claim 48, please see (Richardson: section 0067-0068, 0103, 0138, 0201, 0205-

0206; DSL Evolution: Section 3.2: The Application Service Provider (ASP), page 7; Section

3.3.1, page 8; Section 4.2.2.1-4.2.2.2, pages 11-12; Section 7.2, page 35).

Regarding claim 49, please see (Richardson: section 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section

2.2, page 4; Section 4.2.2.2, page 12; Section 7.1, page 35).

Regarding claim 50, please see (Richardson: section 0157, 0195-0199; DSL Evolution:

Section: 4.2.1.2, page 11; Section 7.2, page 35).

Regarding claim 51, please see (Richardson: section 0067-0068; 0164-0166, 0186, 0205-

0206, 0211-0212).

Double Patenting

9.   The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine
grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or
improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible
harassment by multiple assignees.   A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection
is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined
application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined
application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference
claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re
Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225
USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re
Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163
USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

       A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may
be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting
ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned
with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the
scope of a joint research agreement.

       Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal
disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR
3.73(b).

10.   Claims 1-51 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-55 of copending Application No.

10/756790 and claims 1-44 of copending Application No. 10/716051 (Notice of Allowability

filed on 11-14-2008). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably

distinct from each other because both applications pertain to the same subject matter as the

instant application including: '...requesting or modifying a desired Quality of Service (QoS)

and/or bandwidth allocation in a Regional/Access Network (RAN) that provides end-to-end

transport between an Application Service Provider (ASP) and Customer Premises Equipment
(CPE) …'.

       However, the claims in the '790 application and '051 application do not disclose a
videoconference using QoS and/or bandwidth allocation in a RAN.

       Examiner takes **official notice** that the limitation '…a videoconference using QoS and/or
bandwidth allocation in a RAN…'is well known in the art and can be combined with the pending
claims to read on the claims of the instant application.

       Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the
copending applications to provide a videoconference using QoS and/or bandwidth allocation in a
RAN.

       This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting
claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

11.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

          A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

12.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. See PTO-892 Form.

13.   Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

          (571) 273-8300 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or call:

          (571) 272-2600 (for customer service assistance)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LISA HASHEM whose telephone number is (571)272-7542. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

14.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Lisa Hashem/
Examiner, Art Unit 2614
/Fan Tsang/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614
February 18, 2009